

**Remarks**

Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-14, and 17-22 are rejected, while claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 15, and 16 are objected to. Claims 1, 5, and 14 are amended herein. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests allowance of claims 1-22.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 15, and 16 are indicated in the Office Action to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication of allowability.

The Office Action asserts that the title of the invention is not descriptive and that a new title is required. The specification is amended herein to provide a new title.

Claims 5 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,064,654 (White-Hauser).

Independent claims 5 and 14, as amended, require adjusting the maximum threshold in response to the delay variation. Advantageously, the claims may be implemented in some embodiments to control the flow of user communications over at least two links in order to maintain an acceptable delay variation over the links.

White-Hauser does not disclose adjusting the maximum threshold in response to the delay variation. Therefore, independent claims 5 and 14 include features that are neither taught nor suggested by the cited reference.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-14, and 17-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 6,574,216 (Farris et al.) and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,449,259 (Allain et al.).

Independent claims 1, 5, and 14, as amended, require adjusting the maximum threshold in response to the delay variation, as previously stated.

Farris does not disclose adjusting the maximum threshold in response to the delay variation. Allain does not disclose adjusting the maximum threshold in response to the delay variation.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 5, and 14 include features that are neither taught nor suggested by any of the cited references. Claims 4, 8-13, and 17-22 are allowable for the same reasons as claims 1, 5, and 14.

Applicant submits that there are numerous additional reasons in support of patentability, but that such reasons are moot in light of the above remarks and are omitted in the interests of brevity. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1-22.

Please feel free to call me to discuss the patentability of the pending claims.

Date: 5/4/06

  
SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Gregg Jansen, Reg. No. 46,799  
Setter Ollila LLC  
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 14  
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

**CUSTOMER NO. 028004**

Harley R. Ball  
Sprint Law Department  
6391 Sprint Parkway  
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100  
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100